

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/684,179	10/10/2003	Thorsten Kiehne	02/059 MFE	02/059 MFE 2584	
38263 7	590 06/21/2005	•	EXAM	EXAMINER	
PROPAT, L.L.C. 425-C SOUTH SHARON AMITY ROAD			CHEN, VIVIAN		
•	, NC 28211-2841	OAD	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•	,	•	1773		

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# **Advisory Action**

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/684,179	KIEHNE ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Vivian Chen	1773

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vivian Chen	1773	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 01 June 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP			
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complete following time periods:</li> </ol>	n the same day as filing a Notice o wing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	f Appeal. To avoid at ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or
<ul> <li>a) X The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advi</li> </ul>		e final rejection, whicheve	erislater In no
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI ).	f the final rejection. RST REPLY WAS FILE	D WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	nd the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.
3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bel appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); educing or simplifying	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>see DETAILED ADVISORY ACTION</u> . (See		jected claims.	•
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a</li> </ul>		, timely filed amendm	ent canceling
the non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:		rill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7,9-15 and 17-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered busee DETAILED ADVISORY ACTION.</li> </ol>	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ince because:
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> <li>13. ☐ Other: <u>DETAILED ADVISORY ACTION</u>.</li> </ul>	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	

Vivian Chen Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1773



Application/Control Number: 10/684,179 Page 2

Art Unit: 1773

#### **DETAILED ADVISORY ACTION**

1. Claims 8, 16 have been cancelled by Applicant.

### Response to Proposed Amendments

2. The proposed amendments will <u>NOT</u> be entered because they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. The newly added claim limitations (e.g., the recited sliding coefficients of friction; a continuous coating; recited amounts of methyl methacrylate) have not been previously claimed or presented.

## Response to Arguments

- 3. Applicant's arguments filed 6/1/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- (A) Applicant argues that EP '004 and the other previously relied upon references each fail to explicitly disclose every single feature of the claimed invention, in particular continuous acrylic coatings or coatings with the recited methyl methacrylate content. However, since the proposed amendments have <u>NOT</u> been entered, Applicant's arguments directed to the proposed claim amendments are moot.
- (B) Applicant argues that EP '004 teaches away from low friction coatings because it discloses the use of adhesion-promoting acrylic coatings. However, while the reference may mention such coatings as an illustrative example of a useful functional coating, the reference does not prohibit the application of other types of conventional performance-enhancing coatings.

Furthermore, the mere fact that a coating has improved adhesion to other materials (e.g., metallized layers, other coatings, etc.) does not automatically mean that it is incapable of also having desirable frictional or non-blocking properties; therefore, the mention of adhesion-promoting coatings in EP '004 is not wholly incompatible from the use of coatings with desirable running or slip properties.

- (C) In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the amount of methyl methacrylate in the coating) are not recited in the presently rejected claim(s), since the proposed amendments have <u>NOT</u> been entered. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
- (D) Applicant argues that POLYMER SCIENCE fails to disclose the claimed invention in its entirety. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). EP '004 discloses a majority of the features recited in the present claims. POLYMER SCIENCE is relied upon to illustrate that it is well known in the art to utilize coatings to modify the surface properties of a film.
- (E) Applicant argues that CULBERTSON ET AL '784 fails to disclose a continuous acrylic coating. However, since the proposed amendments have <u>NOT</u> been entered, Applicant's arguments are deemed moot.

Art Unit: 1773

#### Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivian Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1506. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 6 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney, can be reached on (571) 272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

The General Information telephone number for Technology Center 1700 is (571) 272-1700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 13, 2005

Vivian Chen Primary Examiner Art Unit 1773

Mai Cha